

REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Office Action of November 28, 2005 in which claims 1-3, 6-10, 19-22, 25-27, 29, 30 and 34 were rejected and claims 4, 5, 11-18, 23, 24, 28, 31-33 and 35 objected to.

With regard to the rejected claims, the US Office Action states that the independent claim 1 is objected for lack of novelty in view of the prior art of Boltz (US 6 311 055).

Please note that the independent claim 1 as on file in the present U.S. application is identical to claim 1 as amended during international preliminary examination, and that claim 1, as amended, has been acknowledged in the IPER to define novel as well as inventive subject-matter. The novelty rejection based on Boltz will now be discussed in relation to the present invention.

The present invention relates to a method for call control by a called terminal device receiving a call via a communication network for intelligent network services. The prior art by Boltz, though relating to call control, merely relates to barring outgoing calls. See in particular column 2, lines 32 to 38 and for an alternate embodiment see lines 49 to 55. There, it is stated for both embodiments that a call is barred dependent on specific conditions at call origination. Still further, column 5, line 5 to 21 expressly states that each subscriber record in the SS database (reference numeral 60 in the SDP 56 of ISDN/SS7 44) includes barring data... to allow... originating calls and/or outgoing calls to be barred. The barring data is contained in a subscriber record 62 within the SS 60. Thus, no call control by a called terminal device is disclosed. Rather, outgoing and/or originating calls originated by a mobile device are controlled based on data prevailing in the network and/or network nodes.

Similarly, this is also derivable from the description of the operation of the Boltz invention with reference to Figure 3 (column 6, line 55: "mobile station 18 originates a call...").

The passage cited at column 4, lines 36-41 by the Examiner merely gives an overview of the gateway GMSC 36 and does not relate to the substance of the Boltz disclosure. The Boltz disclosure relates to solving a problem of a lack of flexibility in options available to a mobile subscriber in barring outgoing calls (see column 2, lines 11-13).

Furthermore, various ways of changing the barring data by the user of the mobile station from which the calls are originating are disclosed by Boltz. However, any such modification of call barring data is not related to triggering a presentation service at said service control device responsive to receiving an incoming call, and also, there is no retrieving of information identifying a calling user of a terminal device from an external server. No such feature and/or advantage as outlined in the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10 of the present application are obtainable by the Boltz arrangement. In addition, page 3 of the pending Office Action is very silent concerning any attempt to "read" the step of "if triggered, retrieving information identifying a calling user of a terminal device from an external server" "onto" the Boltz arrangement.

Thus, the Examiner's analysis in this regard is incomplete; and it can not be complete because Boltz just does not show such a feature.

As mentioned, Boltz merely refers to barring of outgoing calls (see also column 8, line 61) but there is no teaching contained therein that a called terminal device might perform a call control based on retrieved information identifying a calling user of a terminal device from an external server.

Claim 1 is the sole independent claim and the above remarks pertain to the dependent claims rejected on the same ground with at least the same force.

Therefore, all the rejected claims are novel over the Boltz reference and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 2, 3, 6-10, 19-22, 25-27, 29, 30 and 34 is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of November 28, 2005 having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-35 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Francis J. Maguire". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "F".

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 261-1234